

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 14-20 are amended, claims 21-26 are added and claims 5 and 11 are cancelled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Alperovich; claims 10-17 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Willehadson et al.; and claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Alperovich in view of Willehadson et al. and Rydbeck.

The rejections noted in the outstanding Office Action are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method of sending personal information using a mobile terminal including inputting personal information data for transmission, inputting a phone number corresponding to a receiving mobile terminal to receive the personal information data, inserting identification information distinguishing the personal information data from other types of data into a user data field of a short message, and transmitting the personal information data to said receiving mobile terminal using a Short Message Service (SMS) with the identification information. Independent claims 10 and 14 include similar features.

The outstanding Office Action indicates Alperovich teaches inserting identification information into a user data field for short messages and cites col. 4, lines 60-65. However, it is

Reply dated: **June 17, 2004**

Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2004

respectfully noted Alperovich is merely directed to retransmitting business card information to other mobile stations that previously received the business cards such that every time a sending user's business card application is updated, it is retransmitted to the other users that previously received the business card based on historical data saved in the sending mobile terminal (see col. 2, line 61 to col. 3, line 6). The historical information in Alperovich is not identification information distinguishing the personal information data from other types of data, but rather is just a list of previous mobile terminals that the business card has been transferred to. In addition, col. 4, lines 60-65 cited by the Office Action also does not teach or suggest inserting identification information into a user data field of a short message as the present invention.

Further, the outstanding Office Action indicates Willehadson et al. teach transmitting personal information data to a receiving terminal as a short message with identification information and cites page 8, lines 10-20 and Fig. 4. However, Willehadson et al. merely teach placing a phonebook header or business card header in the short message system header, but does not specifically describe inserting identification information distinguishing personal information data from other types of data into a user data field of the short message. According to the present invention, the identification information is inserted into the user data field of the message and thus a separate header does not have to be attached to the message.

That is, the present invention can transmit personal information data to a receiver after defining Identification information into the User Data field without modifying a standard Short Message Service system header. However, Willehadson et al. transmits a phonebook information to a receiver by modifying the standard Short Message Service system header.

Reply dated: **June 17, 2004**

Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2004

Therefore, Willehadson et al. requires modifications of the SMS header, whereas the present invention advantageously inserts the identification information into the user data field, which does not require modifying the SMS header.

Further, new claims 21-26 further define the user data field according to the present invention and where the identification information is stored. These features are illustrated in Fig. 6, for example. It is respectfully submitted Willehadson et al. and Alperovich do not teach or suggest the claimed data field.

Further, the outstanding Office Action relies on Rydbeck for teaching the features recited in dependent claims 9 and 18. It is respectfully noted Rydbeck also does not teach or suggest the features recited in newly amended claims 1, 10 and 14.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 10 and 14 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

In addition, the specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/735,532


Docket No. K-0245

Reply dated: **June 17, 2004**

Reply to Office Action dated March 18, 2004

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.

Registration No. 36,186

David A. Bilodeau, Esq.

Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

703-766-3701 DYK/DAB:knv

Date: June 17, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2016\2016-755\29398.doc

BEST AVAILABLE COPY